



Teacher Preparation Program Reporting System

U.S. Department of Education Guidance on Regulations
Published on
October 31, 2016

for the Reporting System Under Title II and the TEACH Grant Program
Under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended

Table of Contents

Purpose of the Guidance	3
Introduction	4
Statutory Overview	5
Overview of the Title II Regulations	5
Overview of the Title IV Regulations	7
Institutional Reporting Requirements	7
Reporting Timeline	7
Resources and References	8
A Note on Teacher Diversity	8
State Reporting Requirements	9
Assessing Teacher Preparation Program Performance	10
Stakeholder Consultation	11
Teacher Preparation Programs Included in State Reporting	11
Large Teacher Preparation Programs	12
Small Teacher Preparation Programs	12
Required Elements of the SRC	13
Student Learning Outcomes	14
Employment Outcomes	17
Who is included in Employment Outcomes reporting?	18
What must States report for Employment Outcomes?	19
High-Need Schools	19
Teacher Placement Rate	20
Traditional Teacher Preparation Program	21
Teacher Retention Rate	22
How should the State include Employment Outcomes in its assessment of program performance?	25
Traditional and Alternative Route Programs	25
Programs Provided Through Distance Education	25
Survey Outcomes	26
Who is included in Survey Outcomes reporting?	26
What must States report for Survey Outcomes?	26
What areas might States want to consider as part of their teacher and employer surveys?	26
Program Characteristics	27
Optional Elements of the SRC and Assessment of Program Performance	28
Reporting Timeline	28
TEACH Grant Eligibility	30
State Program Ratings and TEACH Grant Program Eligibility	30
Accreditation or Alternative State Approval	31
Timeline for changes in TEACH Grant program Eligibility	31
Technical Assistance and Support for Teacher Preparation Programs	32
Consequences for Low-Performing Teacher Preparation Programs	33
Additional Resources and References	34

Purpose of the Guidance

This Guidance is meant to clarify the new requirements for (1) the teacher preparation program reporting and accountability system under Title II of the Higher Education Act (HEA) and (2) the Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) Grant program under Title IV of the HEA that condition TEACH Grant program eligibility on teacher preparation program quality. These requirements are contained in [regulations](#) the U.S. Department of Education (Department) published in the *Federal Register* on October 31, 2016.

The Department has determined that this Guidance is Significant Guidance under the Office of Management and Budget's, Final Bulletin for Agency Good Guidance Practices, 72 Fed. Reg. 3432 (Jan. 25, 2007). See www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/memoranda/fy2007/. Significant Guidance is non-binding and does not create or impose new legal requirements. The Department is issuing this Guidance to provide States, institutions of higher education (IHEs), and other entities operating teacher preparation programs with information to assist them in meeting their obligations under the final regulations in 34 CFR Parts 612 and 686. This Guidance also provides members of the public with information about their rights under the law and regulations.

If you are interested in commenting on this Guidance, please email us your comment at OESE.guidance@ed.gov or write to us at the following address:

US Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

For further information about the Department's Guidance processes, please visit www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/significant-guidance.

Introduction

In a knowledge-based economy, excellent teachers are more important than ever to ensure all children have the knowledge and skills they need to succeed. Research confirms that the most important in-school factor in a student's success is a strong teacher.¹ Effective recruitment, preparation, development, and support of great teachers are critical to the learning and success of America's students.

Preparation and entry into the educator profession is the first stage in the continuum of a teacher's career. A well-prepared teacher will have deep content knowledge and the skills to teach it; understand how to differentiate instruction for diverse student learning styles and needs; know how to access, interpret and use assessment data to monitor progress and adjust lesson planning; intentionally reflect and collaboratively problem-solve; and take ownership over the learning needs of all students.

Currently, far too many teachers and administrators report that new teachers are unprepared when they first enter the classroom, even after completing a teacher preparation program.² In addition, too many institutions that prepare teachers frequently lack outcome data for program graduates to engage in a cycle of continuous improvement, such as being able to identify where and for how long program graduates teach, how graduates perform in the classroom, and how well graduates believe the programs prepared them to teach. The corresponding disconnect between teacher preparation programs and its labor markets can result in a mismatch of specialization with need, leading to hiring gaps for schools and challenges in teacher placement upon program completion. Prospective teacher preparation program candidates also often lack the data they need to make informed decisions about which programs will best suit their needs.

Enacted in 1998 and reauthorized in 2008, Title II of the HEA³ was intended to address these challenges by requiring each State,⁴ in its annual report on teacher preparation, to report criteria used to assess the performance of teacher preparation programs and identify those that are low-performing or at-risk of being considered low-performing.⁵ Despite this requirement, a 2015 [U.S. Government Accountability Office \(GAO\)](#) report⁶ found that some States are not assessing whether teacher preparation programs are low-performing. As such, prospective teachers and their employers may have difficulty identifying low-quality teacher preparation programs, possibly resulting in teachers who are not fully prepared to educate children.⁷

The Title II regulations were developed to strengthen reporting requirements by including measures of accountability based on employment, retention, student learning and other outcomes achieved by novice teachers from each program. These regulations are being implemented amidst a period of significant activity

¹ Aaronson, D., Barrow, L., & Sander, W. (2007). Teachers and student achievement in the Chicago public high schools. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 25(1), 95–135. <http://doi.org/10.1086/508733>; Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica*, 73(2), 417–458. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0262.2005.00584.x>

² U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), "Public School Teacher Data File," 2011–12.

³ All references to "Title II" are to Title II of the HEA, unless otherwise noted

⁴ The HEA defines the States that must provide these annual reports as each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau (the latter three are also known as the Freely Associated States). However, while the Title II regulations require each of the insular areas to prepare and submit a State report consistent with §612.4(a), they exempt them from the need to calculate and report the performance levels of their teacher preparation programs using the procedures and indicators of academic content and teaching skills addressed in §§612.4(b)-(c) and 612.5(a)-(c).

⁵ See sections 205(b)(1)(F) and 207(a) of the HEA.

⁶ See U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) (2015). *Teacher Preparation Programs: Education Should Ensure States Identify Low-Performing Programs and Improve Information-Sharing*. GAO-15-598. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://gao.gov/products/GAO-15-598>.

⁷ Ibid.

in many parts of the country wherein educators, teacher preparation programs and States are working to drive necessary improvements in teacher preparation, and by extension, the quality of teaching. Through the final [regulations](#), the Department aims to build on and support these efforts for greater transparency, accountability, and ongoing program improvement. Throughout this Guidance we refer to this new State-designed System of Performance Reporting and Accountability to be developed by states as the “System”.

Statutory Overview

[Section 205\(a\) of Title II of the HEA](#) requires all institutions of higher education (IHEs) that conduct teacher preparation programs and that enroll students who receive HEA student financial assistance to submit to their States, and make available to the public, an annual report card that contains the information the provision identifies.

Additionally, section 205(b) of the HEA requires States receiving HEA funds to submit to the Secretary, and make available to the public, an annual report on teacher preparation in the State. In particular, section 205(b)(1)(F) requires each State to provide a description of the criteria it uses to assess the performance of teacher preparation programs within IHEs in the State, and requires those criteria to include “indicators of the academic content knowledge and teaching skills of students enrolled in such programs.” Section 207(a) of the HEA further requires each State to use those criteria to identify low-performing teacher preparation programs, to help those programs improve through technical assistance, and to provide the Secretary an annual list of those programs it finds to be low-performing or at risk of being considered low-performing. As described herein, States determine the levels of program performance as well as the weighting of criteria.

Overview of the Title II Regulations

Previously, IHEs aggregated data for all teacher preparation programs offered at the IHE, so that the institutional report provided information on an IHE as a whole, rather than on each individual teacher preparation program offered by the IHE. Similarly, a State reported to the Department aggregated data by IHE or other teacher preparation entity. However, IHEs, or other entities, often operate multiple programs that can vary significantly in quality.

To promote continuous improvement in the preparation of teachers, and ensure availability of more meaningful data, under the final Title II regulations, information about teacher preparation program performance will now be reported at the individual program level. A “teacher preparation program” is defined in §612.2 of the Title II regulations as: a program, whether traditional or alternative route, offered by a teacher preparation entity that leads to initial State teacher certification or licensure in a specific field. In addition, where some participants in the program are in a traditional route to certification or licensure in a specific field, and others are in an alternative route to certification or licensure in that same field, the traditional and alternative route components are considered to be separate teacher preparation programs. The term teacher preparation program includes a teacher preparation program provided through distance education. The definition of a program provided through distance education is one in which 50 percent or more of the program’s required coursework is offered through distance education.

This change to program-level reporting is coupled with the requirement that States assess and report on the performance of individual teacher preparation programs using, at minimum, four indicators. Three of these required indicators—student learning outcomes, employment outcomes, and feedback surveys – will provide specific data on program quality as measured by the effectiveness of the teachers the programs produce, their placement and retention as teachers, perspectives on whether program graduates received sufficient preparation, and important attributes of the program itself.

Although the practice of performance reporting based on indicators like these is new at the Federal level, some States and many institutions—particularly those IHEs that seek recognition from accreditation-issuing organizations such as the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)—are already connecting teacher employment and preparedness survey results of novice teachers, as well as the learning outcomes of students taught by novice teachers, with teacher preparation programs.⁸ As of summer 2016, a number of States, such as Delaware,⁹ Louisiana,^{10,11} North Carolina,¹² Ohio,^{13,14} and Tennessee¹⁵ have begun to develop systems of data collection and reporting that move in this direction.

By requiring the assessment and reporting of performance on these indicators at the program level, prospective teacher candidates and employers of these teachers will be able to make more informed decisions. Further, such differentiated performance reporting also enables productive feedback loops for continuous improvement, benefiting struggling and successful programs alike. In practice, States may desire to celebrate and provide incentives for exemplary programs generating positive outcomes through objective measures, and may ultimately wish to reconsider approval of programs that consistently produce graduates who are underprepared for the rigors of their classrooms. In addition, data that States report on their recent graduates should be used by preparation programs to improve curricula and clinical experiences, by prospective teachers to select preparation programs, and by local educational agencies (LEAs) to improve induction programs and teacher hiring and placement.

To date, the Title II reporting requirements have had IHEs and States report demographic data on students in each institution's or other entity's overall teacher preparation programs; with the implementation of these regulations, student demographic data will now be reported at the individual program level (see Sec. 201 (a)(1)(CV)(ii)). The Department's analysis of these data reported in past State report cards (SRCs) indicates a lack of diversity of teacher candidates in the Nation's teacher preparation programs.¹⁶ Given the importance of a teacher workforce that reflects the diversity in the student body nationwide, the Department encourages States, LEAs, and all providers of teacher preparation programs to examine the data that is made publicly available through the SRC,¹⁷ and consider ways to diversify their pipelines. This is a state-level reporting requirement that should be considered both by states and by preparation providers. We discuss this in more detail in the [Institutional Reporting Requirements](#) section later in this Guidance.

Finally, as part of a productive feedback loop, we encourage LEAs, States, and all teacher preparation providers to collaborate with one another to organize and share data on each of the indicators described in this Guidance, and on any other indicator a State may choose to include in its System.

⁸ See CAEP's website at <http://www.caepnet.org/> for examples of IHEs collection of performance data on outcomes.

⁹ See 2015 Delaware Educator Preparation Program Reports. (n.d.). Retrieved June 27, 2016 from <http://www.doe.k12.de.us/domain/398>

¹⁰ Gansle, K., Noell, G., Knox, R.M., Schafer, M.J. (2010). Value Added Assessment of Teacher Preparation Programs in Louisiana: 2007-2008 TO 2009-2010 Overview of 2010-11 Results. Retrieved from Louisiana Board of Regents.

¹¹ See <http://www.regents.la.gov/page/teacher-preparation-data-dashboards-fact-book>

¹² See the University of North Carolina's Educator Quality Dashboard (n.d.). Retrieved August 1, 2016, from <http://eqdashboard.northcarolina.edu/>

¹³ See, for example: 2013 Educator Preparation Performance Report Adolescence to Young Adult (7-12) Integrated Mathematics Ohio State University. Retrieved from [http://regents.ohio.gov/educator-accountability/performance-report/2013/Ohio State University/OHSU_Integrated Mathematics.pdf](http://regents.ohio.gov/educator-accountability/performance-report/2013/Ohio%20State%20University/OHSU_Integrated%20Mathematics.pdf).

¹⁴ <https://www.ohiohighered.org/educator-accountability/performance-report>

¹⁵ See Report Card on the Effectiveness of Teacher Training Programs, Tennessee 2014 Report Card. (n.d.). Retrieved November 30, 2015, from <http://www.tn.gov/thec/article/report-card>

¹⁶ "News You Can Use: Enrollment in Teacher Preparation Programs." (2015). U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. Higher Education Act Title II Reporting System Issue Brief. Retrieved from https://title2.ed.gov/Public/44077_Title_II_Issue_Brief_Enrollment.pdf

¹⁷ See the 2015 Title II HEA Reports National Teacher Preparation Data. Retrieved from <https://title2.ed.gov/Public/Home.aspx#>

Overview of the Title IV Regulations

Title IV of the HEA defines an eligible institution to participate in Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) Grant Program, in part, as one that is “high-quality.” In the TEACH Grant Program final regulations, to remain eligible for TEACH grant participation, a high-quality teacher preparation program must not have been rated as low-performing or at-risk for two out of three years. In the case of a teacher preparation program provided by distance education, to lose eligibility, that program must have been rated as low-performing or at-risk for two out of three years by the same State. For more information on this, please refer to the TEACH Grant Eligibility section later in this Guidance.

Institutional Reporting Requirements

The final Title II reporting requirements make two changes to the institutional report cards (IRCs) produced by IHEs:

- Program-level reporting: IRCs must report separate information for each teacher preparation program within the institution.
- Indication of whether each program is a teacher preparation program provided through distance education.

Under the definition of the term “[teacher preparation program](#)” in §612.2 of the final regulations, it may be common for a single IHE to offer multiple types of programs. For example, an IHE that offers a secondary mathematics teacher preparation program, might do so as either an alternative route or as a traditional route to teacher licensing or certification. Or, it might offer this program with sufficient coursework offered through distance education to make the teacher preparation program one that, for purposes of reporting program performance under the Title II regulations, is provided through distance education. In any of these situations, the IHEs will need to identify in its IRC those of its teacher preparation programs that are alternative route or provided through distance education.

In addition, teacher preparation programs may be hybrid, with some students taking courses in a traditional program – whether or not taking coursework through distance education – and other students taking courses in an alternative route program. An IHE, for example, may have a single secondary school mathematics teacher preparation program, but with some students enrolled in the traditional program and others enrolled in an alternative route program. In this case, the definition of a teacher preparation program in §612.2 provides that each of these components is its own teacher preparation program; the IHE would therefore need to separately report on each in its IRC. Moreover, should the program enroll students who participate in two different alternative route programs (i.e., it has students enrolled in the traditional program as well as students in both Alternative Route Programs A and B), each of these three components is its own program, and the IHE will need to report separately on each. We encourage an IHE with a single Alternative Route Program that includes multiple partner organizations to report those individually.

IHEs will need to work with States in the academic year of 2016-2017 to establish a process for submitting required information in their IRCs to the States, about each individual teacher preparation program, as the term is defined in the final Title II regulations.

Reporting Timeline

Under the final Title II regulations, reporting timelines for the IRC do not change. IHEs that operate a teacher preparation program and enroll students receiving financial assistance under Title IV of the HEA must begin reporting under the final Title II regulations not later than April 30, 2018, and report annually thereafter.

In doing so, IHEs must:

- Use the new definition of teacher preparation program in their reporting of pass rates and other information about the program;
- Identify and report on all programs they conduct; and
- At a minimum, provide all IRC information to the general public by posting it on the institution's website.

A table that illustrates the reporting dates for the IRC, along with other reporting dates, is included in the State Reporting Requirement section of this Guidance.

Resources and References

Completing the IRC requires collaboration among individuals within the IHE, the State Title II Coordinator, testing companies conducting certification or licensure assessments in the State, and a technical assistance (TA) provider the Department will identify. With so many organizations and individuals involved in the reporting process, it is important to know whom to contact when questions or problems arise.

IHEs should contact the TA provider with any questions pertaining to program-type classification, a program's performance rating, and technical difficulties related to the Title II IRC reporting system. The testing company should be contacted with questions pertaining to assessments (*e.g.*, reporting or verifying pass rates). Until the Department has identified a TA provider, questions or comments can be sent to OESE.guidance@ed.gov.

A Note on Teacher Diversity

Title II reporting has required IHEs to report demographic information on teacher preparation candidate cohorts in their IRCs as described above; this requirement will continue under the new regulations, now at the program level. We have learned from the [2015 Title II HEA Reports National Teacher Preparation Data](#),¹⁸ that today's teacher corps does not reflect the communities and students it serves,¹⁹ which has implications for our public education system's ability to meet its mission for excellence and equity.

Adults of color are underrepresented both in the nation's classrooms²⁰ and in the teacher preparation programs that produce graduates who teach in these classrooms,²¹ resulting in what has been called the "diversity gap," or the difference in the proportion of minority teachers and minority students in public schools.²² The national teacher preparation data referenced above demonstrate that in 2012-2013, for IHEs with teacher preparation programs, the overall student population in those IHEs was more diverse than the subset of students in those IHEs who are enrolled in teacher preparation programs. In 2013-2014, 73 percent of teaching candidates identified as white, while only 51 percent of K-12 students were white. Individuals identifying as Hispanic or Latino of any race, or as black or African American were underrepresented in

¹⁸ See the 2015 Title II HEA Reports National Teacher Preparation Data. Retrieved from <https://title2.ed.gov/Public/Home.aspx#>

¹⁹ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. "Table 209.10: Number and percentage distribution of teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools, by selected teacher characteristics: Selected years, 1987-88 through 2011-12." Digest of Education Statistics, 2013. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_209.10.asp

²⁰ U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. "Table 209.10: Number and percentage distribution of teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools, by selected teacher characteristics: Selected years, 1987-88 through 2011-12." Digest of Education Statistics, 2013. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_209.10.asp

²¹ See the 2015 Title II HEA Reports National Teacher Preparation Data. Retrieved from <https://title2.ed.gov/Public/Home.aspx#>

²² Hannah Putnam, Michael Hansen, Kate Walsh, and Diana Quintero, "High Hopes and Harsh Realities: The Real Challenges to Building a Diverse Workforce," 2016, Brookings Institution, <https://www.brookings.edu/research/high-hopes-and-harsh-realities-the-real-challenges-to-building-a-diverse-teacher-workforce/>

teacher preparation programs. While 25 percent of K-12 students were Hispanic or Latino, only 11 percent of teaching candidates identified as Hispanic or Latino. Similarly, while 16 percent of K-12 students were black or African American, only 10 percent of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs identified as black or African American.²³ A recent study on the pursuit of a diverse educator workforce found that the diversity gap is caused by hurdles along every stage of the process to becoming a teacher, including college completion, interest in the career, hiring into the profession, and retention in the profession.²⁴

These disparities between student body and teaching corps demographics are significant because they can translate to meaningful differences in student outcomes.²⁵ Recent studies have found that race biases teachers' expectations for students; black students, are more likely to be identified as gifted if they are taught by black teachers.²⁶ Similarly, researchers found that black teachers are more likely to believe that a black student will graduate from high school and go to college than white teachers evaluating the same black student.²⁷

We encourage IHEs, States and LEAs to consider how increasing teacher diversity can benefit schools and students. Though the Title II reporting system is not designed to address the challenges of increasing the diversity of effective teachers, this reporting system co-exists with other initiatives, as well as research that shows that diversity in schools, including representation of underrepresented minority groups among educators, can provide significant benefits to all students.²⁸ For more information on how States and LEAs may use funds under Title II, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), to improve the recruitment, placement, support, and retention of educators, including educators from underrepresented minority groups, to meet the needs of all students, including diverse student populations see Building Systems of Support for Excellent Teaching and Learning, the non-regulatory guidance on ESSA Title II, Part A, available online at: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/essatitleiipartaguidance.pdf>.

We invite States and LEAs to consider this Guidance on implementation of the final regulations for the Title II reporting system in the context of these initiatives, and those at the State and local levels, to increase the overall quality and diversity of their teachers.

State Reporting Requirements

Under Title II, States are required to report annually on the quality of teacher preparation programs in their State and make that information widely available to the general public by posting the SRC on the State's website. To the maximum extent possible, we encourage States to create such websites in a manner that is not

²³ "News You Can Use: Enrollment in Teacher Preparation Programs." (2015). U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. Higher Education Act Title II Reporting System Issue Brief. Retrieved from https://title2.ed.gov/Public/44077_Title_II_Issue_Brief_Enrollment.pdf

²⁴ Hannah Putnam, Michael Hansen, Kate Walsh, and Diana Quintero, "High Hopes and Harsh Realities: The Real Challenges to Building a Diverse Workforce," (August 2016). , Brookings Institution. Available at: , <https://www.brookings.edu/research/high-hopes-and-harsh-realities-the-real-challenges-to-building-a-diverse-teacher-workforce/>

²⁵ Dee, Thomas. "Teachers, Race, and Student Achievement in a Randomized Experiment." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86 (2004) 195 -210; Egalite, Anna, Brian Kisida, and Marcus A. Winters. "Representation in the Classroom: The Effect of Own-race Teachers on Student Achievement," *Economics of Education Review*, 45, (April 2015) 44–52.

²⁶ Grissom, Jason, and Christopher Redding. "Discretion and Disproportionality: Explaining the Underrepresentation of High-Achieving Students of Color in Gifted Programs," *AERA Open*, 2 (2016), 1-25.

Underrepresentation of High-Achieving Students of Color in Gifted Programs," *AERA Open*, 2 (2016) 1–25.

²⁷ Seth Gershenson, Stephen B. Holt, and Nicholas Papageorge, "Who Believes in Me? The Effect of Student-Teacher Demographic Match on Teacher Expectations," *Economics of Education Review*. 52. (June 2016), 209–224

²⁸ Dee, Thomas. "Teachers, Race, and Student Achievement in a Randomized Experiment." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86 (2004) 195 -210; Egalite, Anna, Brian Kisida, and Marcus A. Winters. "Representation in the Classroom: The Effect of Own-race Teachers on Student Achievement," *Economics of Education Review*, 45, (April 2015) 44–52.

just widely available but in a format that is user friendly: searchable and with the ability to compare across programs and program types.

In the sections that follow, we describe the requirements of the final Title II regulations, including: with whom States must consult to design the performance reporting system; what States must report; and when they must report. We also provide best practices for designing a State's overall System to help ensure that every student in the State has access to a well-prepared, highly-effective teacher.

Assessing Teacher Preparation Program Performance

Under the Title II regulations, all States are required to implement a System to assess the quality of each of their teacher preparation programs. Each State has wide discretion in designing its System, provided that it meaningfully differentiates programs using at least three performance levels and the determination of each program's level of performance is based, at minimum, on the indicators in §612.5 (see the "[Required Elements of SRC and Accountability System](#)" section of this Guidance for further information). The three required performance levels are:

1. Low-performing teacher preparation program;
2. Teacher preparation program that is at-risk of being low-performing; and
3. Effective teacher preparation program

Each State must report in its SRC, no later than October 31, 2019, the procedures it established for assessing and reporting the performance of each teacher preparation program in the State. It must do the same every four years, and at any other time that the State makes a substantive change to the weighting of the indicators or the procedures for assessing and reporting the performance of each teacher preparation program in the State, as provided in §612.4(c).

Under §612.4(b)(2), the procedures to be reported in the SRC must, at a minimum, include:

- The weighting of the indicators and any other criteria the State uses;
- The criteria (including indicators of academic content and teaching skills of program graduates) the State uses for establishing performance levels for all teacher preparation programs;
- The data that correspond to each of the indicators and other criteria;
- The criteria the State uses to assess a program's level of performance from the most recent Title II reporting year;
- Any State-level rewards or consequences associated with designated performance levels; and
- Any opportunities for programs to challenge the accuracy of their performance data and classification of the program.

Additionally, under §612.4(c)(2), the State must periodically examine the quality of the data collection and reporting activities it conducts and, as appropriate, modify those procedures through the consultative process that is described in this upcoming section.

The Department encourages States to use a fourth performance level as a way to highlight particularly high performing teacher preparation programs. Recognizing exemplary performance identifies models of practices that are potentially worthy of replication for programs within and across institutions. Some States, such as [Delaware](#),²⁹ [Florida](#),³⁰ and [Rhode Island](#),³¹ already report four program performance levels. With more ability

²⁹ "Feedback on the 2015 Delaware Educator Preparation Program Reports." 2015. Educator Preparation Program Reports Revisions & Considerations. Delaware Department of Education.

to distinguish among performance levels, IHEs and the public can better differentiate among programs. As they have in the past, States have wide discretion in determining how to classify programs into different performance levels. However, regardless of whether a State chooses to include more than three performance levels, because of the importance of student learning outcomes, we encourage the State only to identify a teacher preparation program as being effective (or higher) if it has determined that the program exhibits strong or improved student learning outcomes.

It is worth underscoring the importance of meaningfully differentiating among programs. A performance system is not useful if it groups together a program in which teacher candidates and program graduates feel well prepared, obtain jobs, retain employment as teachers in areas in which they were prepared, and produce high levels of student growth and one in which program graduates feel unprepared, cannot find or maintain employment, and produce low levels of student growth. States should examine how their procedures differentiate levels of program performance to ensure that they are meaningful.

Stakeholder Consultation

Under the final Title II regulations, each State is required to develop its System in consultation with a representative group of stakeholders.

The consultative group must include, at a minimum, representatives of:

- (a) Leaders and faculty of traditional and alternative route teacher preparation programs;
- (b) Students of teacher preparation programs;
- (c) LEA superintendents;
- (d) Small teacher preparation programs;
- (e) Local school boards;
- (f) Elementary through secondary school leaders and instructional staff;
- (g) Elementary through secondary school students and their parents;
- (h) IHEs that serve high proportions of low-income students or students of color;
- (i) English learners, students with disabilities, and other underserved elementary and secondary students;
- (j) Officials of the State's standards board or other appropriate standards body; and
- (k) At least one teacher preparation program provided through distance education.

States are not required to follow any particular format or frequency for engaging these stakeholders, but should strive to ensure that their consultative process is as inclusive and substantive as possible.

Teacher Preparation Programs Included in State Reporting

Under §612.4 of the final Title II regulations, each State must report on the quality of all teacher preparation programs in its State,³² regardless of whether the teacher preparation entity is required to submit an IRC and/or enroll teacher candidates receiving student financial assistance under the HEA. However, in reporting on a program's quality, a State uses different procedures depending on whether or not the program meets certain program size thresholds, discussed below. The program size thresholds apply to all programs, including teacher preparation programs provided through distance education.

³⁰ "Guide for Performance Review of Educator Preparation in Rhode Island (PREP-RI)." 2013. Rhode Island Department of Education: Office of Educator Quality.

³¹ "Florida Department of Education Continued Program Approval Standards for Initial Teacher Preparation (ITP) Programs." 2015. Florida Department of Education.

³² Definitions for Traditional and Alternative Certification Programs can be found in the previously published Institutional and Program Report Card System (IPRC) User Manual, available at: <https://title2.ed.gov/public/ta/iprcmanual.pdf>.

Large Teacher Preparation Programs

States are required to report separately on all teacher preparation programs that graduate a total of 25 or more candidates a year who have received initial licensure or certification from the State that allows them to serve in the State as teachers of record for public elementary and secondary students and, at a State's discretion, preschool students. States may, at their discretion, set a lower program size threshold, particularly in cases where a requirement of 25 candidates will result in the exclusion of a large number of programs in a State.

In addition to those programs that are physically located in a State, States are also required to report on teacher preparation programs provided through distance education that meet the State's established program size threshold (*e.g.*, 25 or more recent graduates whom the State certifies in a given year as permitting them to serve as teachers of record). For example, if a teacher preparation program physically located in State A offers a majority of its coursework through distance education and State B certifies 25 recent graduates from that program each year as eligible to serve in State B as teachers of record, State B must report on the teacher preparation program's quality using the program size threshold procedures in §612.4(b)(1) 0(b)(3)(i). Similarly, State A would only be required to report using these procedures if it certified at least 25 graduates from that program provided through distance education as eligible to serve as a teacher of record in State A.

Small Teacher Preparation Programs

§612.4 of the final regulations provides three options for aggregating data for teacher preparation programs that produce fewer than 25 recent graduates (or such lower threshold as the State may establish) who have received initial licensure or certification from the State authorizing them to serve as teachers of record:

- 1.) *Combining similar teacher preparation programs offered by the same teacher preparation entity.* For example, if an IHE offers teacher preparation programs in middle school math and high school math, each of which annually produces 15 such recent graduates a year, the State could report on the program's performance by combining data for the two programs and report the combined data in its SRC.
- 2.) *Combining data across years for the same program.* For example, if a college has a teacher preparation program that produces 10 such recent graduates per year, the State could combine data for the 2018, 2019, and 2020 graduating classes for reporting on the program's performance in its SRC.
- 3.) *A combination of 1 and 2 above.* For example, if an alternative route certification program offers separate teacher preparation programs for high school chemistry and physics that each produce 10 novice teachers per year, the State could combine reporting on each of these programs by combining data for the 2018 and 2019 graduating classes and reporting the combined data in its SRC.

We strongly recommend that States thoughtfully approach aggregation of data across programs and/or years to ensure that the resulting reporting for each program can provide the State and prospective teacher candidates with the most meaningful data possible on individual small programs, and at the same time protect the privacy of individual teachers in those programs. Aggregation of performance information across programs and/or years is not ideal. Indeed, if not done carefully, it could mask important variation in quality across those programs or make it difficult to detect considerable year-to-year variation in program quality. However, working with its stakeholders, we are confident that a State's use of these alternative methods accommodates the need for generating a meaningful annual snapshot of program quality for these small programs, while producing reliable and valid measures of quality on whether a program is low-performing or at-risk of becoming low-performing.

States are **not** required to report on:

- Teacher preparation programs that, even after using the aggregation methods outlined above, do not meet the program size threshold (e.g. a preparation entity that has only one program that produces 4 or 5 graduates a year); or
- Any individual teacher preparation program if reporting such data would be inconsistent with Federal or State privacy and confidentiality laws and regulations.

Required Elements of the SRC

Although States have wide discretion in the totality of the indicators and criteria they may use to assess and report on the performance of each teacher preparation program, under §612.4(b)(2) and 612.5, each State must ensure that it includes in its SRC data for at least the following indicators of academic content knowledge and teaching skills, and uses these data in determining the level of the program's performance:

- 1.) Student learning outcomes;
- 2.) Employment outcomes;
- 3.) Survey outcomes; and
- 4.) Program characteristics.

States establish the weights assigned to each of these indicators (and any other indicators or criteria the State may establish) in determining each program's overall level of performance. However, we encourage States to give significant weight to the first three of these indicators. We also encourage States to be as transparent as possible regarding any other indicators or criteria the State elects to use, and report their reasons for including any non-required measures, and their data sources and methodology for each measure. As with the required indicators of academic content knowledge and teaching skills, the regulations require the State to report the data they collect and use, as well as the weighting they apply, for any other indicator and criterion.

Reporting these data for all applicable indicators and criteria has a number of benefits. For example, it promotes transparency by informing teacher preparation programs and the public about the basis for the State's assessment of which teacher preparation programs are most effectively preparing future teachers, as well as which ones are struggling. It helps those administering these programs understand areas of strength and weakness. It also helps the State target support for programs that need help, informs employers of program graduates' performance, and informs prospective teacher candidates about the performance of programs they are considering.

Some preparation programs are already using outcome-oriented data to inform their program design and improvement. For example:

- The [Arizona State University's Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College](#)³³ uses Title II data provided by the State as well as internal student satisfaction surveys to improve its program's curriculum. After examining these data, the college increased the student teaching clinical practicum from one semester to an entire year. During student teaching, all students are placed in high needs schools, receive the professional development districts provide for teachers, and are assessed using similar teacher evaluation tools implemented by districts to evaluate teachers. According to 2014 State employment data, the college had a higher retention rate in high needs schools than other programs in the State.
- [The Urban Teachers Residency Program](#)³⁴ in Washington, D.C. in conjunction with John Hopkins University School of Education uses survey data to improve the residents' teaching and the overall

³³ See <http://education.asu.edu/for> more information.

³⁴ See <http://www.urbanteachers.org/for> more information.

effectiveness of their program. The program provides a 1-year residency with placement in public and charters schools in Washington, D.C., Baltimore, and Dallas/Fort Worth. In recognition of the importance of teacher diversity, the program makes an effort to increase the number of teachers of color with more than half of its residents being people of color. Using survey data to inform curriculum development and the residency, the program has high rates of teacher retention after 3 years in the classroom and resident and host teacher program satisfaction.

- [The Grow Your Own Teachers Illinois Initiative](#)³⁵ (GYO), in conjunction with Northeastern Illinois University, is a program that recruits paraprofessionals, parents, and community members in low-income communities to become highly effective teachers through cultivating partnerships with community organizations, higher education institutions, and school districts. The majority of the program's cohort is made up of people of color and nearly half of the program participants teach in the areas of special education and bilingual education. GYO works in conjunction with the Illinois Board of Higher Education and studies its beginning teachers to identify areas of strength, as well as areas for improvement. As a result, the program has demonstrated promising indicators of increasing the academic achievement of low-income students and teachers' cultural competency.

As illustrated by these programs, there are many different ways in which States can create systems that appropriately consider the unique needs of preparation programs across their State, utilizing data to continuously improve.

The following table describes each required indicator and also describes what the State must include under §§612.5(a)(1)-(3), as well as what it may include:

Student Learning Outcomes

States <u>must</u> :	States <u>may</u> :
<p>Calculate the aggregate student learning outcomes of all students taught by novice teachers using one of the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Student growth: the change in student achievement between two or more points in time; or (b) A teacher evaluation measure that includes student growth for all students and other measures of professional practice; or (c) Another State-determined measure relevant to calculating student learning outcomes, including academic performance, and that meaningfully differentiates among teachers; or (d) A combination of (a), (b), or (c). 	<p>Meet option (c) through a measure the State develops, such as one of the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of non-assessment-related methods of assessing student learning, including high-quality student work portfolios or high-quality student surveys, or student growth objectives; • Use of State assessments required under the ESEA where available; • Use of value-added or other statistical methods in measuring student growth.

³⁵ See http://www.growyourownteachers.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=3D95%26Itemid%3D27 for more information.

Who is included in Student Learning Outcomes reporting?

Under §612.5(a)(1), and as illustrated in the above table, States are required to calculate aggregate student learning outcomes for all students taught by novice teachers, except that the State may if it wishes exclude student learning outcomes of students taught by those teachers who teach in private schools or who teach in another State. As defined in §612.2, novice teachers are teachers of record in their first three years of teaching elementary or secondary public school students, and may include, at the State's discretion, teachers of preschool students.

For purposes of identifying whether someone qualifies as a novice teacher, and therefore is subject to this reporting requirement, the year in which that individual completed her or his teacher preparation program is **not** relevant. For example, if an individual completed a teacher preparation program in 2015, but does not begin teaching in a public elementary or secondary school in the State where she is certified until the 2019-2020 school year, she is a novice teacher in that year (and will be for the next two years of teaching, even if those years are not sequential). Similarly, if someone is enrolled in an alternative route program and becomes a teacher of record during the 2018-2019 school year, she is a novice teacher in that year even though that she will not complete her program until the 2019-2020 school year.

What must States report for Student Learning Outcomes?

States may choose among the “must” options listed in the table above for reporting student learning outcomes. Options (a) and (b) in the table’s “must” column call for the use of student growth alone or as part of a teacher evaluation system. Option (c) permits States alternatively to use innovative other approaches that demonstrate teacher contribution to student learning including student academic performance. Option (d) recognizes that States may want to combine two or more of the other three options; for example, a State could select one method in arts-related fields or special education programs, while relying on the State’s standard teacher evaluation system results in other fields.

For options involving student growth measures, the Title II regulations define student growth as the change in student achievement between two points in time. States have full discretion to establish how student achievement is measured.

If a State chooses to use student growth either alone or as part of teacher evaluation system, it is not required to use any specific measure of growth, such as value-added measures, nor is it required to use statewide assessments that had been required under the ESEA. Among the commonly used methods to measure student growth, States today use their statewide assessments, other high-quality assessments, or high-quality portfolios of student work. States can measure how much growth was achieved in many ways, including using simple years of gain, more complex statistical models like value-added or student growth percentiles, or by comparing student performance to student growth goals set by educators at the start of a school year. Included in the [resource section](#) of this document are several sources for more information about various ways to measure student growth.

The arts often pose difficulties for school districts in assessing teacher contribution to student learning and student work portfolios can help in these disciplines in particular. One recommended example is the [Tennessee Fine Arts Student Growth Measure System](#). This system uses a peer review process wherein teachers collect, self-score, and submit in a portfolio student work samples showing evidence of student growth. In a blind peer review process, trained reviewers use a [scoring guide](#) grounded in State and national standards to determine a growth score, supporting teachers’ abilities to deliver standards-based instruction. Also, [Louisiana](#) can serve as a helpful model for demonstrating how to link student learning outcomes with providers of teacher preparation in the State, as well as how to effectively develop and support a feedback loop to inform adjustments to the preparation program. In general, we encourage States that choose to use another State-determined measure to ensure that the chosen measure is reflective of both the quality of a

teacher's preservice preparation and the teacher's contribution to the ultimate academic success of that teacher's students.

To meet option (b) from the table, a State may also choose to use data from a teacher evaluation system to meet the §612.5(a)(1) student learning outcomes requirement, provided that measure includes at least three performance levels and uses student growth for all students as well as other valid measures of professional practice in assessing teachers' performance. Those other measures could include observations based on rigorous teacher performance standards, teacher portfolios, and student and parent surveys. Many States have implemented teacher evaluation systems that meet these requirements. The Department recognizes that, as States collect data about these systems and practice ongoing improvement, those systems will continue to mature over time. For more information about ways to design and implement teacher evaluation systems, see the resource list.

Whatever approach is taken to measuring student learning outcomes under this regulation, it is important to note that data used for a program's student learning outcomes measure is not reported by individual student, individual school or individual teacher. Rather, student learning outcomes achieved by novice teachers and applicable to a particular teacher preparation program will be aggregated across all schools that employ novice teachers the program prepared. Federal and state privacy protections apply to whichever method is used.

Two examples of how the results might look, one from Option (a) and one from Option (b) are illustrated here:

OPTION A	<i>Student Growth</i>
IHE	Student Learning Gains
Program A	1.2 years
Program B	.9 years
Program C	1.5 years

OPTION B	<i>Teacher Evaluations</i>
IHE	% effective or better
University A, Program A	79%
University A, Program B	92
University B, Program C	86

How should the State include Student Learning Outcomes in its System?

While student learning outcomes (and data on these outcomes for each program) must be included in some way, the Title II regulations do not specify the amount of weight a State must assign to student learning outcomes in its performance reporting system. However, given that the most central purpose of any teacher preparation program is to prepare teachers to be successful in the classroom and to help students learn, we recommend that States place a significant weight on this measure in their systems.

In addition to flexibility regarding the weight assigned to student learning outcomes, States also have flexibility in how they assess student learning outcomes relative to each performance level. For example, a State could set an absolute standard for performance against which all teacher preparation programs are measured, such as whether a teacher preparation program's graduates, on average, produce one year of growth in student achievement. The State could then give a positive rating to programs that met the standard and a negative one to those that do not. Alternatively, States might find that a better method could be to base ratings on a sliding scale, with programs generating higher levels of student growth receiving higher ratings.

We feel this approach would yield more meaningful differentiation among programs than an absolute standard.

States have discretion in how they make each of these decisions. We note that simplicity and transparency are critically important, since the objective is to provide meaningful information to employers, prospective teacher candidates, and institutions and other providers of teacher preparation programs. We also note that a range of data about how teachers perform in the classroom (including observations by well-trained supervisors and some measures of teacher impact on student growth) are required components for accreditation by CAEP, not only for reporting but also that such data be summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.³⁶

Finally, with regard to tracking student learning outcomes to individual teacher preparation programs, North Carolina offers a model of how to match student data findings with specific programs, as opposed to the overall IHE that administers them. In doing so, it provides valuable information for those preparation programs.³⁷ [The Educator Quality Dashboard](#) at the University of North Carolina provides a publicly accessible, online tool to view and analyze data related to recruitment and selection into the workforce as well as performance and job placement following graduation.

Employment Outcomes

States <i>must</i> :	States <i>may</i> :
<p>Include for each program, the average:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Teacher placement rate (for traditional programs); (b) Teacher placement rate in high-need schools; (c) Teacher retention rate; and (d) Teacher retention rate in high-need schools. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weight retention more heavily than placement; • Weight placement and retention in high-need schools more heavily than in non-high-need schools; • Exercise Alternative Route Flexibility – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ States are not required to report on the overall placement rate for Alternative Route Programs (although they may, and are still required to report on placement in high-need schools). ○ Further, States may weight the employment outcomes for alternative route programs differently, provided differences are transparent and result in equivalent levels of accountability. • Exercise Distance Flexibility – States may weight the placement rate for programs provided through distance differently, provided differences are transparent and result in equivalent levels of accountability.

³⁶ See this resource from CAEP <http://www.caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/standards/caep-standards-one-pager-061716.pdf?la=en> for the full list of required components for program accreditation.

³⁷ See http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/Teacher_Preparation_Program_Student_Performance_Data_Models_NCTQ_Report as well as the University of North Carolina's Educator Quality Dashboard (n.d.). Retrieved August 1, 2016, from <http://eqdashboard.northcarolina.edu/>

Who is included in Employment Outcomes reporting?

When calculating employment outcomes, States are primarily concerned with recent graduates who have become novice teachers and novice teachers who are currently employed teachers (as applied to graduates from teacher preparation programs provided through distance education, only those novice teachers who had been certified by the State are included here).

Recent graduates are those individuals who completed their teacher preparation programs within the three most recent Title II reporting years that preceded the current reporting year. For example, in the State's October 2024 SRC, it will be reporting on the 2023-2024 academic year, and individuals who completed their teacher preparation programs in the 2020-2021, 2021-2022, and 2022-2023 academic years to fulfill the reporting requirements related to recent graduates. Due to the nature of the definition, the group of program completers considered recent graduates changes from year to year. For example, in the table below, we highlight the group of individuals included in the recent graduate definition for each year:

■ Recent graduate

Graduation Year	2021 SRC	2022 SRC	2023 SRC	2024 SRC
2017-2018	■			
2018-2019	■	■		
2019-2020	■	■	■	
2020-2021		■	■	■
2021-2022			■	■
2022-2023				■

In addition to recent graduates, States must also be concerned with recent graduates who receive State certification or licensure and become novice teachers, noting that both of those designations will be needed to calculate placement rate (discussed later in this document). As noted earlier in the Student Learning Outcomes section, a novice teacher is an individual in her or his first three years as a teacher of record in public elementary and secondary schools in the State. Designation as a novice teacher is unrelated to graduation date. We use examples beginning with the 2021 SRC, because, as explained below, the teacher retention rate used for the 2019 and 2020 SRCs use a period shorter than the three most recent Title II reporting years, and no teacher retention rate is required for the 2018 SRC.

Finally, §612.2 uses the term “teacher of record” in calculating a program’s teacher retention rate (and teacher retention rate in high-need schools). Under the definition of teacher retention rate in §612.2 and the provision for reporting this rate in §612.5(a)(2)(i)(C) and (D) and (a)(2)(ii)(A), States will need to identify current teachers of record in the State who are in each of the three cohorts of novice teachers immediately preceding the current Title II reporting year. However, §612.5(a)(2)(ii)(B) establishes different reporting rules for teacher retention rates included in SRCs to be submitted in September 2018 through 2020.

The following discussion of employment outcomes addresses more specifically how each of these terms comes into play.

What must States report for Employment Outcomes?

Under §612.5(a)(2)(i) States must annually calculate and report, for each teacher preparation program:

- (a) Teacher placement rate (for traditional preparation programs);
- (b) Teacher placement rate in high-need schools;
- (c) Teacher retention rate; and
- (d) Teacher retention rate in high-need schools.

Though listed as four items in the Title II regulations, we note that teacher placement rate in high-need schools and teacher retention rate in high-need schools are simply a disaggregation of the teacher overall placement rate and teacher retention rate, respectively, specific to high-need schools. It is important that States are able to identify high-need schools as defined in §612.2 of the regulations and section 200(11) of the HEA. Further, we also note that a novice teacher may move between a non-high-need school and a high-need school, and vice versa, which must be correspondingly accounted for in program reporting and accountability for the calculation of both placement and retention rate.

As discussed in the *Alternative Route Preparation Programs* section below, the regulations do not require that States report on the overall teacher placement rate for alternative route preparation programs, but they must report on those programs' placement rate in high-need schools.

High-Need Schools

Under the HEA, a school qualifies as a high-need school if it meets either an absolute standard or a relative one. The absolute standard identifies as high-need all elementary schools in which at least 60 percent of students qualify for free or reduced-price lunch under the [Richard P. Russell National School Lunch Act](#) and any non-elementary school in which at least 45 percent of students qualify for free or reduced-price lunch under the same Act. For the relative standard, schools that rank in the highest quartile of schools in an LEA on the basis of one of the following are also considered high-need:

- (a) The percentage of students aged 5 through 17 in poverty counted in the most recent Census data approved by the Secretary;
- (b) The percentage of students eligible for a free or reduced-price school lunch under the Richard P. Russell National School Lunch Act;
- (c) The percentage of families receiving assistance under the State program funded under [Title IV of the Social Security Act](#);
- (d) The percentage of students eligible to receive medical assistance under the Medicaid program; or
- (e) A composite of two or more of the measures described in (a) through (d).

To illustrate the application of this definition, consider the two LEAs described below:

LEA #1

School	% Free or Reduced-Price Lunch
ABC Elementary	47%
DEF Elementary	25%
GHI Middle	25%
JKL High	20%

LEA #2

School	% Free or Reduced-Price Lunch
123 Elementary	85%
456 Elementary	82%
789 Middle	65%
10 High	50%

Although LEA #2 above has much higher numbers of students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch, both LEAs have schools that meet the definition of a high-need school. In LEA #1, a ranking of schools by the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch puts ABC Elementary in the highest quartile. ABC Elementary would therefore be considered a high-need school. In LEA #2, regardless of the ranking of individual schools, all schools exceed the absolute standard for elementary and non-elementary schools – 60 percent and 45 percent, respectively. Therefore, all schools in LEA #2 would qualify as high-need schools. Because each LEA with at least four schools will have at least one high-need school regardless of the school's absolute poverty level, States may wish to consider applying a significantly greater weight to employment outcomes for novice teachers who work in LEAs and schools that serve high-poverty areas (i.e. high-need schools) than for novice teachers who work in schools that serve lower-poverty areas.

Teacher Placement Rate

The teacher placement rate, as defined in §612.2, measures the percentage of recent graduates that have become novice teachers and is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Teacher Placement Rate} = \frac{\text{Recent graduates who have been novice teachers}}{\text{Total recent graduates}}$$

Under the definition of teacher placement rate in §612.2 of the Title II regulations, only those graduates who have become novice teachers (regardless of retention) for the grade level, grade span, and subject area in which they were prepared may be included in the numerator for this calculation.

If a teacher is placed in a non-high-needs school in their first year of teaching, that teacher will be counted as placed for the purpose of the placement rate, but because they are not teaching in a high-needs school they will not be counted as placed (included in the numerator) in the calculation of teacher placement in high need schools. However, if that teacher moves in their second or third year of teaching into a high-needs school, that teacher will then be counted as placed for purposes of both the teacher placement rate and the teacher placement rate in high-need schools.

The teacher placement rate must be calculated annually for each traditional teacher preparation program; as described later in this section, though a State is not required to report annually on teacher placement in alternative route programs, it may choose to do so.

As described in §612.5(a)(2)(iii), at the State's discretion the placement rate may exclude one or more of the following, provided that the State uses a consistent approach to assess and report on all of the teacher preparation programs in the State:

- Recent graduates who have taken teaching positions in another State;

- Recent graduates who have taken teaching positions in private schools; or
- Recent graduates who have enrolled in graduate school or entered military service.

We encourage States to publicize these data, for example as an addition to the SRC, as a way to make information they provide about each program more robust.

In the preamble to the [Title II regulations](#), the Department included a chart (Table 1) with a set of hypothetical data and an explanation of how a State would use these data to calculate a program's teacher placement rate. Below we have provided two basic examples— one for traditional teacher preparation programs and one for alternative route programs. We have also highlighted each year in which an individual would be identified as a recent graduate. (The special rules for the teacher placement rate for programs provided through distance education will be discussed later.)

Traditional Teacher Preparation Program

Placement reporting by year for Teachers A-D

TITLE II REPORTING YR	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
ACADEMIC YR	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
A	GRAD	✓	✓	✓	N	N
B		GRAD	✓	✓	✓	N
C			GRAD	N	✓	✓
D				GRAD	N	N
TEACHER RETENTION RATE	N/A (Pilot YR)	$\frac{1}{1}$ = 100%	$\frac{2}{2}$ = 100%	$\frac{2}{3}$ = 67%	$\frac{2}{3}$ = 67%	$\frac{1}{2}$ = 50%

GRAD = Individual met all requirements for program completion in that year.	✓ = Novice teacher for P-12 public school students in that year.	N = Not a novice teacher for P-12 public school students in that year.
---	--	--

In traditional teacher preparation programs, individuals typically do not become teachers of record until after they have met all of the requirements for program completion. For State reports to be submitted in 2018 and 2019, given the recent effective date of these regulations, reporting rules are different and use fewer cohorts than for later reporting, which uses data for cohorts from the prior three years. See the chart on page 28 of this Guidance. In this example, the program has one graduate per year (A in 2016-2017, B in 2017-2018, C in 2018-2019, and D in 2019-2020). In the 2018 SRC, the State would be reporting on the percentage of recent graduates (graduated in the preceding three years) who have become novice teachers. In 2018, only one teacher (Teacher A) is a recent graduate, having graduated the prior year. Teacher A has also become a novice teacher by the 2017-2018 academic year. As a result, the State would calculate this program's placement rate as 100 percent (1/1). In 2019, both Teacher A and Teacher B are recent graduates and both have become

novice teachers. The program's teacher placement rate would be 100 percent (2/2). In the 2020 SRC, Teachers A, B, and C are all recent graduates having graduated in the three preceding reporting years. However, only Teachers A and B have become teachers of record by the 2019-2020 academic year. Therefore, the teacher placement rate for this program would be 67 percent (2/3).

In the 2021 SRC, Teacher A is no longer a recent graduate and would therefore be removed from the analysis. However, Teacher D would be added, having graduated the preceding year. Of the three recent graduates (Teachers B, C, and D), two have become novice teachers by the 2020-2021 academic year (Teachers B and C). Therefore, the teacher placement rate for this program would be 67 percent (2/3). In 2022, Teacher B is no longer a recent graduate and is removed from the analysis. Of the two recent graduates (Teachers C and D), only one has become a novice teacher (Teacher C). Therefore, the program's placement rate is 50 percent (1/2).

Alternative Route Preparation Program

Due to the fundamental characteristics of alternative route programs, and the likelihood that all participants will be simultaneously employed as teachers of record while completing coursework, the use of placement data in all public elementary and secondary schools for performance rating is not required for alternative route programs. However, such placement data for teachers in high-need schools must be calculated, reported and used in consideration for the program's performance. Further, if employed as a teacher of record in a high-need school prior to program completion, that circumstance will count as placement.

Teacher Retention Rate

As defined in §612.2, the teacher retention rate measures, for each cohort of novice teachers, the percentage of teachers who have been continuously employed as teachers of record between their first year as a novice teacher and the current Title II reporting year.

$$\text{Teacher Retention Rate} = \frac{\text{Teachers Continuously Employed from First Year to Current Year}}{\text{Total Novice Teachers in Cohort}}$$

The teacher retention rate must be calculated every year for **each** cohort of novice teachers who were first identified as teachers of record in each of the three preceding Title II reporting years. We provide the following example data-set from the preamble to the Title II final regulations to provide additional support for how to calculate teacher retention rate. In the table below, the years highlighted (both with darker and lighter coloration) are the years in which an individual would be identified as a recent graduate.

For purposes of calculating the retention rate, if a teacher moves from a non-high-need school to another non-high-need school in the same state, there should be no change for the purposes of the teacher retention rate. However, if a teacher moves from a high-need school to a non-high-need school, that teacher would continue to be counted as retained for purposes of the teacher retention rate but not retained for the purposes of the teacher retention rate for high-need schools because that teacher has not been continuously employed as a teacher of record in a high-need school through the current year.

Teacher Retention Rate

TITLE II REPORTING YR	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
ACADEMIC YR	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
A	✓	✓	✓	N	
B	✓	✓	✓	N	
F	✓	✓	✓	N	
G	✓	✓	N	N	
J	✓	N	N	N	
C		✓	✓	✓	N
H		✓	✓	✓	N
K		✓	N	✓	✓
D			✓	✓	✓
E				✓	✓
I				✓	✓

RETENTION RATE FORMULA BY COHORT

2017-18	N/A (Pilot YR)	$\frac{4}{5} = 80.0\%$	$\frac{3}{5} = 60.0\%$	$\frac{2}{5} = 40.0\%$	
2018-19			$\frac{2}{3} = 66.7\%$	$\frac{2}{3} = 66.7\%$	$\frac{2}{3} = 66.7\%$
2019-20				$\frac{1}{1} = 100\%$	$\frac{1}{1} = 100\%$
2020-21					$\frac{2}{2} = 100\%$

DARK cells = the first year that a teacher was a teacher of record for P-12 schools.	LIGHT cells = years when a State reports a teacher retention rate using data from that teacher.	✓ = Novice teacher for P-12 public school students in that year.	N = Not a novice teacher for P-12 public school students in that year.
---	--	--	---

In this example, this particular teacher preparation program has five individuals who became novice teachers for the first time in the 2017-2018 academic year (Teachers A, B, F, G, and J). For purposes of this definition, we refer to these individuals as a cohort of novice teachers. As described below, the State will first calculate a teacher retention rate for this teacher preparation program in the October 2019 SRC. In that year, the State will determine how many members of the 2017-2018 cohort of novice teachers have been continuously employed through the current year. Of Teachers A, B, F, G, and J, only Teachers A, B, F, and G are still teaching in 2018-2019. As such, the State calculates a teacher retention rate of 80 percent for this teacher preparation program for the 2019 SRC.

In the October 2020 SRC, the State is required to report on the 2017-2018 cohort and the 2018-2019 cohort. The membership of the 2017-2018 cohort does not change. From that cohort, Teachers A, B, and F were employed in both the 2018-2019 academic year and the 2019-2020 academic year. The 2018-2019 cohort consists of Teachers C, H, and K. Of those, only Teachers C and H are employed as teachers of record in the 2019-2020 academic year. Therefore, the State reports a teacher retention rate of 60 percent for the 2017-2018 cohort--because three teachers (A, B, and F) were continuously employed through the current year out of the five total teachers (A, B, F, G, and J) in that cohort--and 67 percent for the 2018-2019 cohort--because 2 teachers (C and H) were employed in the current year of the three total teachers (C, H, and K) in that cohort.

In the October 2021 SRC, the State will be reporting on three cohorts of novice teachers for the first time -- the 2017-2018 cohort (Teachers A, B, F, G, and J), the 2018-2019 cohort (Teachers C, H, and K), and the 2019-2020 cohort (Teacher D). Of the 2017-2018 cohort, only Teachers A and F have been continuously employed as a teacher of record since the 2017-2018 academic year, therefore the State will report a retention rate of 40 percent for this cohort (two out of five). Of the 2018-2019 cohort, only Teachers C and H have been continuously employed since the 2018-2019 academic year. Despite being a teacher of record for the 2020-2021 academic year, Teacher K does not count towards this program's teacher retention rate because Teacher K was not a teacher of record in the 2019-2020 academic year, and therefore has not been continuously employed. The State would report a 67 percent retention rate for the 2018-2019 cohort (two out of three). For the 2019-2020 cohort, Teacher D is still a teacher of record in the current year. As such, the State reports a teacher retention rate of 100 percent for that cohort.

Beginning with the 2022 SRC, the State no longer reports on the 2017-2018 cohort. Instead, the State reports on the three most recent cohorts of novice teachers -- 2018-2019 (Teachers C, H, and K), 2019-2020 (Teacher D), and 2020-2021 (Teachers E and I). Of the members of the 2018-2019 cohort, both Teachers C and H have been employed as teachers of record in each year from their first year as teachers of record through the current reporting year. Teacher K is still not included in the calculation because of the failure to be employed as a teacher of record in the 2019-2020 academic year. Therefore, the State reports a 67 percent retention rate for this cohort. Of the 2019-2020 cohort, Teacher D has been employed in each academic year since first becoming a teacher of record. The State would report a 100 percent retention rate for this cohort. Teachers E and I, of the 2020-2021 cohort, have also been retained in the 2021-2022 academic year. As such, the State reports a teacher retention rate of 100 percent in the 2022 SRC for this cohort.

As described in §612.2 of the Title II regulations, at the State's discretion, the retention rate may exclude one or more of the following, provided that the State uses a consistent approach to assess and report on all of the teacher preparation programs in the State:

- Novice teachers who have taken teaching positions in other States;

- Novice teachers who have taken teaching positions in private schools;
- Novice teachers who are not retained specifically and directly due to budget cuts; and
- Novice teachers who have enrolled in graduate school or entered military service.

How should the State include Employment Outcomes in its assessment of program performance?

As described in “Required Elements of the SRC and Reporting System” earlier in this Guidance, we urge States to apply significant weight to employment outcomes in high-need schools. Nonetheless, the regulations do not address the amount of weight a State must assign to employment outcomes in its assessment of teacher preparation program performance.

Traditional and Alternative Route Programs

As described earlier, under the Title II regulations, while States must include a teacher placement rate in high-need schools for alternative route programs, a teacher placement rate in all schools is not required because the structure of alternative route programs varies to a large enough degree that employment outcomes are not equally indicative of their program quality in comparison with traditional programs. For example, in alternative route teacher preparation programs, individuals are often placed as teachers of record prior to completing their program. As a result, an alternative route program may have a 100 percent teacher placement rate, regardless of the quality of the program. In consultation with stakeholders, a State may determine that such a difference might result in inappropriate classifications of alternative route programs in the State’s assessment of a program’s level of performance, and therefore might opt to exclude the teacher placement rate in their assessment of alternative route programs and make the retention rate or placement in high-need schools, correspondingly, more heavily weighted. Unless a State chooses to include a teacher placement rate in all schools in its System, the State must report, in the SRC, the differences in assessment for traditional and alternative route programs and reasons for these differences. Those differences must be transparent and result in equivalent levels of accountability.

Programs Provided Through Distance Education

States are also permitted, under the Title II regulations, to weight the teacher placement rate differently for teacher preparation programs provided through distance education than they do for programs not provided through distance education. A State may wish to do this because under the definition of teacher placement rate in §612.2, the denominator for teacher placement rate differs for programs provided through distance education. For such programs, the denominator is the number of recent graduates who have obtained initial certification or licensure in the State, while the denominator for programs not provided through distance education is simply the number of the program’s recent graduates. As such, programs provided through distance education may have higher teacher placement rates than other programs as individuals who complete the program but never obtain certification or licensure in the State are excluded from the denominator. States may therefore want to weight the teacher placement rate differently for these programs. Whenever a State chooses to assess teacher placement rate differently for programs provided through distance education, the State must report, in the SRC, the differences in assessment and reasons for these differences and those differences must be transparent and result in equivalent levels of accountability.

Survey Outcomes

States <i>must</i> :	States <i>may</i> :
Collect qualitative and quantitative data including a teacher survey and an employer survey designed to capture perceptions of whether novice teachers who are employed in their first year of teaching in the State possess the academic content knowledge and teaching skills needed to succeed in the classroom.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to survey teachers and employers beyond the first year of teaching; Include program-specific questions in addition to a base set of common questions; and Survey teachers and employers of teachers who teach out of State or in private schools.

Who is included in Survey Outcomes reporting?

In measuring survey outcomes, States are required to survey all novice teachers in their first year of teaching in the State, as well as their employers that year. States are **not** required to survey teachers or their employers after their first year, nor are they required to survey recent graduates who are not novice teachers.

What must States report for Survey Outcomes?

At minimum, States must report the results of both a teacher survey and an employer survey for each teacher preparation program in the State. As with other indicators that the Title II regulations require States to use in assessing the performance of each teacher preparation program, the State also must report how these results are used in the calculation of a program's level of program performance. The regulations do not prescribe any specific way a State must report survey results, or the weighting the State must use in determining the level of a program's performance.

What areas might States want to consider as part of their teacher and employer surveys?

While States must obtain quantitative and qualitative data designed to capture perceptions of whether novice teachers who are employed in their first year of teaching in the State possess the academic content knowledge and teaching skills needed to succeed in the classroom, States have discretion in how they design survey elements. We encourage the teacher and employer surveys to include questions that address how well each surveyed group – the teachers themselves and the teachers' employers – feel the teachers were prepared to advance student achievement. Teacher surveys should capture feedback reflecting on how their preparation program prepared them with necessary content and pedagogical knowledge, training that included quality clinical preparation, and were challenged to meet rigorous teacher candidate exit qualifications. Regardless of licensure area, States may particularly want to consider the novice teacher's readiness to address the highest-need elementary and secondary students and correspondingly survey program graduates and employers on how well prepared novice teachers are to teach these students.

In addition, we recommend that both teacher and employer surveys include elements that are designed to capture feedback in key areas, such as how well teachers:

- Use data to assess and address student learning challenges and successes³⁸
- Provide differentiated teaching strategies for students with varied learning needs, including English learners;³⁹

³⁸ Julie Greenberg and Kate Walsh, "What Teacher Preparation Programs Teach about K-12 Assessment: A Review," 2012, http://www.nctq.org/dmsview/what_teacher_Prep_Programs_Teach_K-12_Assessment_NCTQ_Report

³⁹ Deborah Ackerman and Zoila Tazi, "Enhancing Young Hispanic Dual Language Learners' Achievement: Exploring Strategies and Addressing Challenges, 2015, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ets2.12045.pdf>

- Keep students engaged;⁴⁰ and
- Manage classroom behavior⁴¹:

The simplest way to survey is to ask the same questions of all novice teachers and from all of their employers. However, a State might also want to include in the surveys customized questions for programs that address the same content area (e.g. high school math) in order to receive feedback that is specifically tailored to each program – and which therefore can specifically assist that program’s own improvement efforts. Provided that the State uses the same weighting of survey results in determining the level of performance of each program that addresses the same content area, this approach may be particularly helpful to getting specific feedback to the program-types and those who operate them on how well important program elements are working. For example, a State could have teachers and employers rate the preparation of novice teachers in various domains on a five-level Likert scale

Nothing in the Title II regulations requires the teacher survey or employer survey to be in a particular format.

Finally, the Title II regulations do not require a minimum response rate for the teacher or employer surveys. Nonetheless, States should make every effort to ensure as high a response rate as possible so that the surveys reflect the actual experiences of all novice teachers in the State and that they help States obtain reliable data for all teacher preparation programs.

Some States, like Florida, [Georgia](#)⁴², Mississippi, Missouri, Oregon, and Texas, are already gathering these kinds of data for preparation programs in their States. In other cases, IHEs (particularly those seeking recognition by accreditation-issuing organizations such as CAEP) are already in the practice of developing, disseminating, and reviewing surveys to employers and correspondingly reviewing that feedback to improve their program practice. In some cases a REL may be a valuable resource to assist in designing a survey, or to recommend a State with their own survey worthy of adaptation.

Program Characteristics

States <u>must</u> :	States <u>may</u> :
<p>Report whether the program:</p> <p>(a) Is administered by an entity accredited by an agency recognized by the Secretary for accreditation of professional teacher education programs;⁴³ or</p> <p>(b) Produces teacher candidates--</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> With content and pedagogical knowledge; With quality clinical preparation; and Who have met rigorous teacher candidate exit qualifications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract with a third party skilled in teacher preparation program review, in the absence of a recognized programmatic accreditor to assess the elements of (b) on behalf of the State; and • Rely on the State’s program approval process to ensure the elements in (b) are present in each program.

⁴⁰ Gallup, “State of America’s Schools: The Path to Winning Again in Education,” 2014, <http://www.gallup.com/services/176003/state-america-schools-report.aspx>

⁴¹ Julie Greenberg, Hannah Putman and Kate Walsh, “Training Our Future Teachers: Classroom Management,” 2014, http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/Future_Teachers_Classroom_Management_NCTQ_Report

⁴² <http://education.gsu.edu/wp-content/blogs.dir/92/files/2013/10/Georgia-Preparation-Program-Effectiveness-Measures-Framework.pdf>

⁴³ At the time of this Guidance’s publishing, the Secretary has not recognized an accreditation agency.

Under §612.5(a)(4), a State must determine:

- Whether the program is administered by an entity accredited by an agency recognized by the Secretary for accreditation of professional teacher education programs; or
- Whether the program produces teacher candidates with content and pedagogical knowledge, who have had quality clinical preparation, and who have met rigorous teacher candidate exit qualifications.
 - If the State has determined that an organization that has accredited the program has properly found that it has the program characteristics identified in §612.5(a)(4) (i.e., the characteristics in (b) in the chart above), the State may say so and identify the accrediting organization.

The Title II regulations in §612.5(a)(4) do not set a particular standard for each of these characteristics and so provide States with discretion as to the factors it will use to make these determinations. In many cases, we assume States will have already made determinations on each of these elements during their normal program approval process.

In every case, we encourage States, to the extent practicable, to ensure that their performance standards they use for these metrics represent high expectations for teacher preparation programs, rather than simply minimum requirements. We also encourage States, to the extent practicable, to ensure that their performance standards for these metrics ultimately reflect the quality of the programs, and that they provide information that facilitates program improvement and, by extension, improvement in student achievement.

Optional Elements of the SRC and Assessment of Program Performance

A State's overall rating of a program's performance should reflect a comprehensive view that, as emphasized in the introduction to this Guidance, meaningfully differentiates and communicates the variability in strength and rigor of teacher preparation programs across a State. As such, in addition to student learning outcomes, employment outcomes, survey outcomes, and program characteristics, States may include in their SRCs any additional indicators of academic content knowledge and teaching skills that reflect a teacher's effect on student performance, provided that the State uses the same indicators for all teacher preparation programs in the State. Similarly, a State also may use other criteria to assess program performance, and may determine the relative weight of these other indicators and criteria.

As with student learning outcomes, employment outcomes, survey outcomes, and program characteristics, States must report in their SRCs both the data they use that respond to these other indicators and criteria, and the overall weights they give to these other indicators and criteria in assessing a teacher preparation program's level of performance.

Reporting Timeline

Under the final Title II regulations, the annual reporting timeline will not change. IRCs will continue to be due in April of each year and SRCs will continue to be due in October of each year.

2018 will serve as a pilot year for reporting under the final Title II regulations. In SRCs due in October 2018, States will have the option of submitting their SRCs under either the SRC procedures in place before the regulations were released October 31, 2016 (linked [here](#)), or using the new SRC procedure under the Title II regulations. If they choose to report using the new SRC procedures, the content of their 2018 SRCs regarding a program's level of performance and data that support it will have no consequences.

Not later than October 2019, and annually thereafter, §612.4(a) requires all States to report using the new SRC procedures. More specifically, in that year, §612.4(b) and §612.5 require States (except insular areas identified in §612.4(d)) to report

(a) The procedures for assessing the performance of teacher preparation programs in the State established in consultation with the State’s consultative group of stakeholders, in particular—

- (1) The indicators of academic content knowledge and teaching skills and any other criteria they use to assess each program’s level of performance;
- (2) the weighting in uses for each indicator and criterion; and
- (3) Any State-level rewards or consequences associated with the designated performance levels, and

(b) for each teacher preparation program:

- (1) Student learning outcomes for novice teachers who began teaching during the 2017-2018 or 2018-2019 academic year;
- (2) Employment Outcomes- the teacher placement rate overall (for traditional programs), and the teacher placement rate in high-need schools for novice teachers who began teaching during the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 academic year;
- (3) Employment Outcomes- the teacher retention rate overall, and teacher retention rate in high-need schools for novice teachers who began teaching in the 2017-2018 academic year;
- (4) Survey outcomes for novice teachers who began teaching in the 2018-2019 academic year;
- (5) Information about program characteristics;
- (6) How, if the program’s number of program graduates is less than 25 or such lower program size threshold the State may establish, the State uses aggregation procedures available in §612.4(b)(3)(ii) to report the program’s performance; and
- (7) The summative level of the program’s performance (e.g. effective, at-risk, low-performing) and, if applicable, the numerical score of the program’s performance.

After submission of the October 2019 SRC, the State must report on the procedures in (a), above, established in consultation with stakeholders every four years thereafter, and whenever the State makes a substantive change to its methodology.

As provided in the preamble to the notice of the final Title II [regulations](#), the full schedule of SRC reporting for the first four of these indicators, and the cohorts for which States are required to report for each indicator, is provided below.

Year	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
IRC Due Date	April 30, 2018	April 30, 2019	April 30, 2020	April 30, 2021	April 30, 2022
SRC Due Date	October 31, 2018 (Pilot)	October 31, 2019	October 31, 2020	October 31, 2021	October 31, 2022
Student Learning Outcomes	C1	C1, C2	C1, C2, C3	C2, C3, C4	C3, C4, C5
Teacher Placement Rate	C1	C1, C2	C1, C2, C3	C2, C3, C4	C3, C4, C5
Teacher Retention Rate	N/A	C1	C1, C2	C1, C2, C3	C2, C3, C4
Survey Outcomes	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5

Notes:

C1: Cohort 1, novice teachers whose first year in the classroom is 2017-18

C2: Cohort 2, novice teachers whose first year in the classroom is 2018-19

C3: Cohort 3, novice teachers whose first year in the classroom is 2019-20

C4: Cohort 4, novice teachers whose first year in the classroom is 2020-21

C5: Cohort 5, novice teachers whose first year in the classroom is 2021-22

TEACH Grant Eligibility

Recognizing the importance of equitable access to excellent educators for the most disadvantaged students, the Federal Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) Grant Program was created in 2007 through the College Cost Reduction and Access Act to provide financial assistance for future teachers who are needed in our nation's highest-need classrooms and schools nationwide. As authorized by section 420L, et seq. of the HEA, the TEACH Grant program provides grants of up to \$4,000 a year to eligible teacher candidates (who may be new teachers, current teachers, or a retirees from other fields with relevant expertise to teach) who agree to serve as full-time teachers in high-need fields at high-need schools for not less than four academic years within eight years after completing their courses of study.

We encourage IHEs that participate in the TEACH grant program to regularly remind grant recipients of the requirements they must meet to fulfill their service obligations. This includes, but is not limited to, the requirement to annually submit documentation of their qualifying teaching service to the Department.

State Program Ratings and TEACH Grant Program Eligibility

Under the final regulations, starting with the 2021-2022 award year, TEACH Grants are available for students enrolled in a TEACH Grant-eligible program - which is a program, as defined in §668.8, that meets the definition of a “high-quality teacher preparation program not provided through distance education” or “high-quality teacher preparation program provided through distance education” (see below) that is designed to prepare an individual to teach as a highly-qualified teacher in a high-need field and leads to a baccalaureate or master's degree, or is a post-baccalaureate program of study. A program that is a two-year program or is the equivalent of an associate degree, as defined in §668.8(b)(1), may also be a TEACH Grant-eligible program if it is acceptable for full credit toward a baccalaureate degree in a TEACH Grant-eligible program or a master's degree program and prepares a teacher or a retiree from another occupation with expertise in a field in which there is a shortage of teachers, such as mathematics, science, special education, English language acquisition, or another high-need field or a teacher who is using high-quality alternative certification routes to become certified is also a TEACH Grant-eligible program. The definition of a TEACH Grant-eligible program under the current existing TEACH Grant regulations continues to apply until July 1, 2021.

Section §686.2 of the final Title II regulations defines a high-quality teacher preparation program not provided through distance education as a teacher preparation program that offers less than 50 percent of the program's coursework through distance education and:

- Beginning with the 2021-2022 award year, is not classified by the same State to be less than an effective teacher preparation program based on §612.4(b) in two of the previous three years; or
- Meets the exception from State reporting of teacher preparation program performance under §612.4(b)(3)(ii)(D) or §612.4(b)(5).

Correspondingly, a high-quality teacher preparation program that *is* provided through distance education is a teacher preparation program that offers *50 percent or more* of the program's required coursework through distance education and:

- Starting with the 2021-2022 award year and subsequent award years, is not classified by the same State for two out of the three previous years to be less than an effective teacher preparation program based on §612.4(b); or
- Meets the exception from State reporting of teacher preparation program performance under §612.4(b)(3)(ii)(D) or (E).

Accreditation or Alternative State Approval

Many IHEs currently participating in the TEACH grant program established their eligibility to award TEACH grants, in part, on the basis of their accreditation by National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) or Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). However, if either of those entities were to lose their federal recognition, those IHEs will not automatically lose their eligibility to award TEACH grants if those programs meet alternative requirements for State approval under §686.2(1)(i)(B) of the definition of a TEACH Grant-eligible.

IHEs that had established eligibility to award TEACH Grants in part through accreditation by NCATE or TEAC should review the criteria in §686.2 to determine whether they meet those alternative requirements. The Department will provide additional information to affected institutions as soon as that information becomes available.

Timeline for changes in TEACH Grant program Eligibility

The first year in which TEACH Grant program eligibility is impacted under the final regulations is the 2021-2022 Award Year (see Reporting Timeline in State Reporting section for illustration and implementation dates). An otherwise eligible student who received a TEACH Grant for enrollment in a TEACH Grant-eligible program is eligible to receive additional TEACH Grants towards completing that program, even if that program is no longer considered a TEACH Grant-eligible program. If an undergraduate or post-baccalaureate student, that student may not receive more than four Scheduled Awards; if a graduate student, she or he may receive up to two Scheduled Awards.

A teacher preparation program that has lost TEACH grant eligibility would need to reapply to be an eligible participant in the TEACH Grant program. We encourage institutions to inform students of the loss of TEACH grant eligibility in a manner consistent with Federal student financial aid communication procedures.

Technical Assistance and Support for Teacher Preparation Programs

States are responsible for ensuring that teacher preparation programs have the capacity to offer quality instruction and coursework to candidates.

While each State must provide technical assistance and support to any teacher preparation program that it identifies as low-performing, under §612.6 the State is not required to conduct any particular set of activities in supporting low-performing programs. However, the State may consider of the following activities as part of such technical assistance and support:

This may include...	More specifically...
Providing programs with information on the specific indicators used to determine the program's level of performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student outcome data indicated weaknesses in a certain subject area • Job placement and retention rates for a certain cohort that were markedly different from others • What survey outcomes revealed
Assisting programs to address the rigor of their exit criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What the State's review of curricula showed, and identifying other IHEs that may share knowledge in order to help the program to refine and strengthen its exit criteria • What the State's reviewing of raw scores from licensure tests, and/or average number of times a candidate takes to pass a licensure test, revealed, and how the program might use this information to refine its design • If survey data indicate that there were gaps in content proficiency, how the program might revisit curriculum design and exit criteria to ensure students have deeper content knowledge upon completing the program
Helping programs identify specific areas of curriculum or clinical experiences that correlate with gaps in graduates' preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If survey data show that classroom management was a particular gap in proficiency, how the program might revisit its curriculum or clinical experiences in order to strengthen programmatic elements
Helping identify potential research and other resources to assist program improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of other successful interventions in other States, IHEs, or non-IHE teacher preparation providers • How the program can connect with organizations with expertise in educator preparation and teacher effectiveness improvement • How the program can connect with appropriate resources available through accrediting organizations

Additionally, recognizing and rewarding those that embrace an outcomes-based system can motivate further improvement, while also sharing best practices so that struggling programs have models of excellence from which to learn. One example in practice is Wisconsin, which is in the process now of implementing the "[Wisconsin Quality Educator Initiative](#)" that is designed to enhance the quality of educator development

from preservice teacher preparation throughout the educator's career. This initiative is to provide technical assistance to both IHEs and to individual programs not offered through IHEs.⁴⁴

Massachusetts also provides a model for implementing policies to support continuous improvement for teacher preparation programs across the state. The collaboration between the Massachusetts State Department of Education and Endicott College demonstrates how the right data compiled by the State can be delivered to a teacher preparation program combined with supportive leadership to embrace a culture of data use from compliance to continuous improvement. Building the internal leadership capacity and ensuring the most valuable high-quality information is provided paves the way for meaningful and ongoing improvement.⁴⁵